UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,368	02/13/2004	Lester F. Ludwig	2152-3035	7886
22242 7590 03/25/2008 FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET			EXAMINER	
			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/779,368	LUDWIG, LESTER F.
Examiner	Art Unit
DENNIS G. BONSHOCK	2173

Application No.

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-39</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. 🛮 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance
because: With respect to 101, the issue had been previously resolved. With respect to that Applicant arguing that the secondary cursor of
Baudel is in a different document, being a tool pallet, the Examiner respectfully submits that the "tool palette" is within the same
"Application Area" space (not a different docuent), such a area is even defined in the applicants specification at column 34, line 8 through column 35, line 3 and in figure 7, where the document drawing area comprises a toolbar. With regard to the Applicant arguing the combination, because Baudel specifically teaches two pointer devices, the Examiner respectfully submits that Baudel is relied upon for the teaching of two pointer in a single application and while it pointes to the advantage of two cursors being
controlled by two pointing devices, Barber teaches an alternative means for controlling two pointers with one pointing device, while teaching it as an alternative to "controlling multiple pointer with multiple pointing devices" (see column 14, lines 4-5 of Barber). Thus Barber teaches both control with a single pointing device and with multiple pointing devices, with advantages to
Barber). Thus Barber teaches both control with a single pointing device and with multiple pointing devices, with advantages to both embodiments.
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)